

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **4 August 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-35. The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18, 30, 31, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 17-31, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al (USPub 2002/0087310, hereinafter "Lee"), in view of Bailey et al (USPub 2004/0088308, hereinafter "Bailey"). Claims 7, 15, 16, 32, and 33 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim..

Objections to the specification

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended paragraph [0051] to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18, 30, 31, and 35 were rejected as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, and 35 to clarify the conditions which cause a node to fire. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0083]-[0088] of the instant application. Additionally, Applicant has amended claims 9-10, 13-14, and 30-31 to correct the indefinite limitations noted by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 18, and 35 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Bailey. Applicant notes that Examiner has cited paragraphs 107

and 108 of Lee, and respectfully points out that Lee has only 41 paragraphs. Applicant assumes that the citation should actually be Bailey.


Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, and 35 to include allowable limitations from claims 16 and 33. Dependent claims 16 and 33 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 18, and 35 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-15 and 17, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 19-32 and 34, which depend upon claim 18, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 22 August 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com